

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1996

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of House Resolution 349, the Flow Control Act of 1996. I am reluctant because of the circumvention of the normal committee process and because there are provisions in this bill that are so narrowly drafted as to affect only one town in my district. In fact, to my knowledge, it's the only town in the country so affected.

The bill generally grandfathers all communities in New York and other States which have actually designated waste management facilities pursuant to duly enacted State and local legislation. The single exception to this situation is the section entitled "Facilities Not Qualified for Flow Control" incorporated into the bill.

This section provides that flow control may not be exercised with regard to any facility if the following conditions are met:

The ordinance was determined to be unconstitutional by a State or Federal court prior to May 16, 1994, and before the date of enactment of the legislation;

The facility is located over a sole source aquifer and within 1 mile of a coastal zone; and

The facility is not fully permitted and operating in compliance with Federal, State, and local regulations.

As I understand it, the bill was further modified in this extraordinary process to ensure that it applied only to facilities within 5 miles of a public beach and 25 miles of a city with a population of 5 million or more. Clearly a reference to New York City.

By its terms, the provision applies to only a single town in the State of New York: North Hempstead. It would not apply to neighboring towns such as Hempstead, Babylon, or Islip, although waste disposal conditions are virtually identical in these towns and the need to manage solid waste is similar. Only North Hempstead would be denied authority to utilize its flow control ordinance in support of a waste management plan.

On its face the bill is unfair. North Hempstead meets the conditions set out in the bill for other towns to take advantage of flow control yet the amendment would deny North Hempstead this authority for no legitimate reason.

The bill will shift from waste companies to residential taxpayers much of the approximately \$10 million annual cost of furnishing waste management services. By denying flow control authority to North Hempstead, the bill will threaten the fiscal solvency of the town because the tipping fees currently generated by the town's flow control ordinance are utilized for the following: \$6 million per year for

debt service on property purchased by the town's solid waste management authority for an incinerator project which was not constructed; \$60 million over several years for remediation of landfills in Port Washington, NY, one of which is a Superfund site and the other which requires closure under Federal environmental regulations; and \$6 million in construction cost for a new solid waste transfer station.

The loss of flow control authority for North Hempstead is particularly egregious in view of the fact that the villages which would benefit utilized the town landfill for 40 years, and should thus bear some of the remediation costs which are now being paid for with flow control tipping fees.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of provisions such as this that the bill should have been considered by committee and should not have come to the floor under suspension of the rules.

Mr. Speaker, flow control authority is crucial to cities and towns across the country. So I hope that as we go to conference with the Senate, this onerous provision will be dropped, providing flow control to all the municipalities that need it.

U.S. FOREIGN MILITARY SALES DURING FISCAL YEAR 1995

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention information submitted pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act with respect to U.S. foreign military sales during fiscal year 1995.

The first table details worldwide government-to-government foreign military sales during fiscal year 1995 for defense articles and services and for construction sales. Total FMS sales for fiscal year 1995 were \$9.029 billion, a decline from \$12.865 billion in fiscal year 1994.

The second table details licenses/approval for the export of commercially sold defense articles and services for fiscal year 1995.

The tables follow:

Total value of defense articles and services sold to each country/purchaser as of September 30, 1995 under foreign military sales (see part II for construction sales)

[In thousands of dollars]¹ Accepted—
fiscal year 1995

Countries	
Part I—Foreign Military Sales:	
Antigua and Barbuda	162
Argentina	15,909
Australia	164,756
Austria	10,462
Bahrain	57,266
Bangladesh	7,542
Barbados	88
Belgium	24,213
Belize	298
Bolivia—Intl. Narc	13,631
Botswana	75
Brazil	58,259

Countries	fiscal year 1995
Brunei	20
Cambodia	1,688
Canada	197,661
Cape Verde	2
Chad	343
Chile	4,084
Colombia	20,732
Colombia—Intl. Narc	10,235
Costa Rica	2,009
Denmark	47,222
Djibouti	50
Dominica	73
Dominican Republic	610
Ecuador	134
Ecuador—Intl. Narc	129
Egypt	1,080,975
El Salvador	7,214
Eritrea	204
Estonia	168
Ethiopia	544
Fiji	15
Finland	218,175
France	767,735
Germany	266,461
Ghana	85
Greece	216,194
Grenada	95
Guyana	67
Haiti	918
Honduras	3,952
India	15
Indonesia	11,293
Ireland	45
Israel	661,282
Italy	31,012
Jamaica	1,169
Japan	715,389
Jordan	15,316
Kenya	2,754
Korea (Seoul)	494,320
Kuwait	83,694
Latvia	234
Lebanon	66,044
Lithuania	341
Luxembourg	68
Malaysia	25,697
Malta	12
Mexico	1,608
Morocco	4,482
Mozambique	368
Nacisa	397
Namibia	60
Namma	1,371
Namsa—F104	350
Namsa—General+Nike	20,011
Namsa—Hawk	928
Namsa—Weapons	7,384
Napmo	2,734
NATO	1,670
NATO AEW+C (0+S)	26,750
NATO Headquarters	221
Netherlands	947,526
New Zealand	9,390
NHPLO	1,630
Niger	589
Norway	12,131
Oas Hq	33
Oman	8,108
Org. of African Unity	763
Pakistan	78
Panama	55
Paraguay	13
Portugal	13,519
Rep. of Philippines	23,025
Romania	12,431
Saclant	6,507
Saudi Arabia	485,613
Senegal	451

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

<i>Countries</i>	<i>fiscal year 1995</i>				
Shape	3,287	Costa Rica	21,514	Spain	285,188
Sierra Leone	3	Cote D'Ivoire	653	Sri Lanka	3,697
Singapore	198,146	Cyprus	995	St. Kitts and Nevis Anguilla	4
Slovakia	(2)	Czech Republic	10,128	St. Lucia	50
Spain	401,722	Denmark	131,470	St. Vincent	53
Sri Lanka	67	Dominican Republic	22,967	Suriname	37
St. Kitts and Nevis	15	Ecuador	52,195	Sweden	1,071,849
St. Lucia	292	Egypt	163,788	Switzerland	238,531
St. Vincent + Gren	25	El Salvador	23,605	Taiwan	27,757
Sweden	12,865	Eritrea	111	Tanzania	25
Switzerland	22,393	Estonia	620	Thailand	159,882
Taiwan	208,123	Ethiopia	93	Trinidad and Tobago	21,789
Thailand	193,496	Finland	1,688,348	Tunisia	5,470
Trinidad—Tobago	155	Faroe Islands	4,000	Turkey	574,747
Tunisia	10,552	Fiji	10	Turkmenistan	600
Turkey	599,092	Finland	16,310	Uganda	133
United Arab Emirates	4,698	France	204,516	Ukraine	1,528
United Kingdom	114,369	French Guiana	441,629	United Arab Emirates	53,546
UNOCHA	766	French Polynesia	22	United Kingdom	2,444,015
Uruguay	2,323	Gambia	2	United Nations	97
Venezuela	36,172	Gabon	1,600	Uruguay	23,284
Zambia	322	Germany	797,503	Uzbekistan	9
Zimbabwe	292	Ghana	7	Various Countries	403,383
Classified totals ³	320,801	Gibraltar	12	Venezuela	61,694
		Greece	177,800	Vietnam	1,060
		Greenland	27	Yemen	1,392
Subtotal	9,029,308	Guatemala	21,997	Zambia	2,475
		Guyana	82	Zimbabwe	719
Part II—Construction Sales:		Haiti	799	Classified Totals ¹	875,292
Bolivia—Intl. Narc	1,340	Honduras	22,234		
Cape Verde	58	Hong Kong	21,274	Worldwide Total	19,707,041
Chad	194	Hungary	331		
Colombia—Intl. Narc	451	Iceland	5,585	¹ See classified annex to CPD.	
Ecuador—Intl. Narc	243	India	17,001	Note.—Details may not add due to rounding.	
Egypt	4,241	Indonesia	80,214	Source: This information was prepared and submitted by the Office of Defense Trade Controls, State Department.	
El Salvador	2,442	Ireland	3,502		
Eritrea	456	Israel	679,993		
Ethiopia	243	Italy	510,828		
Honduras	388	Jamaica	21,284		
Morocco	4,854	Japan	2,163,667		
Saudi Arabia	10,000	Jordan	2,854		
Subtotal	24,911	Kazakhstan	229,027		
Total	9,054,218	Kenya	421		
		Korea, Republic of	985,611		
		Kuwait	568,711		
		Latvia	269		
		Lebanon	732		
		Lithuania	16		
		Luxembourg	315,693		
		Macau	279		
		Malaysia	97,974		
		Maldives	12		
		Mali	1		
		Malta	18		
		Mauritius	1		
		Mexico	44,506		
		Monaco	9		
		Morocco	13,409		
		Namibia	1,327		
		Nepal	62		
		Netherlands	464,058		
		Netherlands Antilles	3,381		
		New Caledonia	216		
		New Zealand	72,728		
		Nicaragua	2,056		
		Niger	420		
		Nigeria	1,231		
		Norway	199,616		
		Oman	10,072		
		Pakistan	105,897		
		Panama	21,494		
		Papua New Guinea	1,925		
		Paraguay	37,198		
		Peru	41,616		
		Philippines	112,923		
		Poland	1,449		
		Portugal	57,584		
		Qatar	2,743		
		Reunion	4		
		Romania	3,430		
		Russia	10,613		
		Saudi Arabia	816,656		
		Senegal	454		
		Singapore	333,244		
		Slovakia	167		
		Slovenia	18,497		
		Solomon Islands	169		
		South Africa	30,178		

Part II—Construction Sales:

Bolivia—Intl. Narc	1,340
Cape Verde	58
Chad	194
Colombia—Intl. Narc	451
Ecuador—Intl. Narc	243
Egypt	4,241
El Salvador	2,442
Eritrea	456
Ethiopia	243
Honduras	388
Morocco	4,854
Saudi Arabia	10,000
Subtotal	24,911
Total	9,054,218

¹ Totals may not add due to rounding.² Dollar value less than \$500.00.³ See the classified annex to the CPD.

Licenses/approvals for the export of commercially sold defense articles/services as of September 30, 1995

<i>[In thousands of dollars]</i>	<i>Cumulative</i>
Albania	39
Algeria	29,520
Andorra	40
Angola	863
Antigua	3
Argentina	45,631
Aruba	6
Australia	698,814
Austria	23,277
Azerbaijan	64
Bahamas, The	2,057
Bahrain	10,124
Bangladesh	5,531
Barbados	28,146
Belgium	192,327
Belize	125
Bermuda	54
Bolivia	31,616
Botswana	1,188
Brazil	108,544
British Virgin Islands	61
Brunei	23,405
Bulgaria	728
Burma	3
Burkina Faso	18
Cambodia	38
Cameroon	626
Canada	19,016
Cayman Islands	35
Chad	5,233
Chile	51,411
China	222,784
Colombia	27,134
Congo	600
Comoros	7

RALPH YARBOROUGH TRIBUTE

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in 1969 when I was a member of the Texas State Senate I had the great honor of introducing the late Senator Ralph Yarborough at a United Labor Legislative Committee luncheon. What I said that day about my friend held true until the day he died. I ask that this tribute to Senator Yarborough be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a memorial to one of the best and most compassionate statesmen that Texas and the U.S. Senate will ever know.

Ralph Yarborough has been in the arena for the little people of Texas as long as I can remember. He has represented the folks from Diboll and Dallas, from Huntington and Houston, from San Augustine and San Antonio, from Kountze and Corsicana, and he has represented them with vigor, compassion and complete disregard for the special interest and the greedy.

This is rare in a Texas politician. Too often the rest of us have to find a reason why we can't do what we know we should. Too often, we find it necessary to compromise with the special interests. Not Ralph Yarborough. He is totally incorruptible. His record of courage and consistency cannot be matched in the United States Senate.

He is the only Senator from the old Confederacy who has dared represent the black man with votes rather than words. He is the only prominent Texas politician who would march with the brown man in their effort to obtain a decent minimum wage.

His trail has been glorious but it's also been long and torturous. He is the most hated of all by the privileged and the powerful. But he is loved by us. Loved because he does right, and loved because he is all we have.

HONORING RUSSELL L. CARSON

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise before my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to recognize Mr. Russell L. Carson. Mr. Carson recently retired as captain of the Waterford Township Police Department after 25 years of dedicated public service. A retirement party in his honor is to be held on February 3, 1996, in Keego Harbor, MI.

Mr. Carson has spent his entire career protecting the public and preserving the laws of this Nation. During his illustrious career, he has received many awards and commendations for his selfless devotion to duty. His tireless spirit has earned him the respect of his colleagues not only in the police department that he helped to command, but also with the countless people whose lives were touched by him. During his 25-year career, Mr. Carson has worked as a patrolman, detective, school liaison officer, lieutenant, staff lieutenant, and captain. Also included in his many duties were detective bureau commander, patrol bureau commander, and administrative services commander.

Mr. Speaker, Russell Carson has worked diligently to help make his community a safer and better place to live. I know that his retirement dinner is not meant to celebrate his departure from law enforcement, rather, the dinner is meant to show him the deep love and respect his colleagues, his family, his friends, and his community have for him. I ask you and my fellow Members of the 104th Congress to join me in paying tribute to such a dedicated public servant, Mr. Russell L. Carson.

HONORING CONGRESSWOMAN
BARBARA JORDAN

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, in honor of this year's theme of African-American women, I wish to recognize the passing of former Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, one of Texas' greatest political figures. She died at the age of 59 from pneumonia, one of the many illnesses which she suffered from in the last years of her life. But the life that she led was extraordinary, and she left a mark that few will ever match, and that none will ever forget.

Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman Jordan distinguished herself from an early age. With her family's encouragement she worked hard to rise above the poverty of her childhood in Houston. She graduated magna cum laude from Texas Southern University. It was there that she first displayed her powerful oratorical skills as a member of the debate team. In 1959 she received her law degree from Boston University.

Mr. Speaker, Barbara Jordan made history by setting a number of firsts. She was the first black State senator in Texas history, elected in 1966. In 1972 she was accorded the high

honor of being elected president pro tempore of the Texas Senate, another first for an African-American. Eight years later she recorded another first, becoming the first black from Texas to be elected to Congress. Although she only served for 6 years in the House of Representatives, her impact was monumental.

It was as a freshman Congresswoman, Mr. Speaker, that the Nation first came to know Barbara Jordan. As a member of the House Judiciary Committee she made one of the defining speeches of the Richard Nixon impeachment hearings. Rising above the political rhetoric, she told the world, "My faith in the Constitution is whole, it is complete, it is total, and I am not going to sit here and be an idle spectator to the diminution, the subversion, the destruction of the Constitution." Indeed, her statements reminded America of what was truly great about this country.

On a more personal note, Mr. Speaker, Barbara Jordan served as one of my earliest political role models. I had a chance to see Congresswoman Jordan speak at the 1976 Democratic National Convention. Like everyone else that heard her speech I was moved not only by her eloquence, but by her definition of public service. "More is required of public officials than slogans and handshakes and press releases," she said. "We must hold ourselves strictly accountable. We must provide the people with a vision of the future." These words continue to guide and inspire me 20 years later.

I wish in the coming days that all Texans would join me in reflecting upon the legacy of Barbara Jordan. She stood for honesty, integrity, and an unswerving commitment to the principles on which this country was founded. Her legacy will endure as we continue to honor these ideals.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT
AND GROWTH ACT

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, the Small Business Investment and Growth Act, to provide needed tax relief for some of America's small business manufacturers.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I strenuously objected to the tax increases of 1990 and 1993, knowing of the negative economic impact these would have on American businesses and individuals. In particular, increasing the maximum individual marginal tax rate from 28 percent to 39.6 percent put a tremendous strain on small businesses organized as S corporations, because they must pay taxes at the individual rate. S corporation manufacturers, facing 36-percent and 39.6-percent tax rates at the highest levels, compete at a significant disadvantage against C corporation manufacturers, which pay a maximum 34-percent rate.

I propose to end this Government-created inequity with the Small Business Investment and Growth Act. Small businesses have created the overwhelming majority of jobs in the United States. We cannot allow the intrusiveness of the Federal Government to neutralize this proven formula of prosperity and job growth.

This act will establish at 34 percent the maximum tax rate for manufacturers organized as S corporations. The taxable small business income would be limited to income from the trade or business of certain eligible small businesses, specifically excluding passive income. To benefit from the maximum 34-percent rate, businesses must also reinvest their after-tax income into the business.

To encourage business reinvestment, each eligible S corporation would establish a new qualified retained earnings account [QREA]. Each year, the QREA will be increased by the taxable earnings of the business. The QREA may then be decreased by either "qualified" or "nonqualified" distributions. Qualified distributions are to enable shareholders to pay the income taxes due on their pro rata share of the taxable income. Should a business choose to make nonqualified distributions from its QREA, it will incur an additional tax, designed to negate the benefit of the maximum rate of 34 percent.

Again, the intent of this legislation is to reward eligible S corporations which reinvest income into the business, thereby creating more jobs. Indeed, successful small manufacturers have been able to create three to four new jobs for every additional \$100,000 they retain in the business.

I recognize that this legislation is a rather modest and narrowly crafted bill, and I realize that there may be other ways to accomplish the end goal of this proposal, which is to equalize the tax treatment of all manufacturers whether they organize as S corporations or C corporations. In that regard, I would welcome a debate on the best means to achieve this end. Personally, I would prefer to lower even further corporate and business taxes, but we are currently constrained by our budget rules. Furthermore, I look forward to an opportunity to completely abolish the present tax code in order to replace it with a more simple tax code that eliminates the inequities inherent in the current code.

The Small Business Investment and Growth Act will, in the near term, provide much needed tax relief to spur economic and job growth, and I would strongly encourage my colleagues to cosponsor it.

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF CLARENCE
HARMON ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate one of the great citizens of my hometown, St. Louis, on his retirement from a unique and valuable career of public service.

Col. Clarence Harmon, who will celebrate his retirement later this week, had a truly distinguished career with the Metropolitan St. Louis Police Department. After working his way up through the ranks, he became the first African-American police chief in the city's history.

Perhaps Chief Harmon's greatest contribution to the police department, and to the safety of our citizens, was his early and fervent commitment to community oriented policing. The success of this program can be seen as the crime rate in St. Louis declines—with the murder rate dropping by 18 percent last year. By

encouraging the police to work hand in hand with the community to address problems before they become crises he has been instrumental in increasing community confidence and police effectiveness.

I join my fellow St. Louisans in congratulating Chief Harmon on a job well done and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF LIVERMORE, CA

HON. BILL BAKER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1871, a group of nine farmers drew together to form a new church in the Livermore Valley in northern California. Started at a time when bars were more prevalent in Livermore than churches, what became the First Presbyterian Church of Livermore has witnessed the remarkable events that have shaped our country—the sorrow of war and the prosperity of peace, the anxiety of drought and the blessing of abundant harvest. And throughout its 125 year history, First Presbyterian has celebrated the importance of family and the centrality of enduring values.

Over its 125 year history, the First Presbyterian Church has grown to a ministry serving not only its 800 members but the greater Livermore Community. Very deliberately, the Church has chosen to stay in its downtown location rather than move to a more comfortable suburban area precisely because of its desire to serve those who most need its assistance. First Presbyterian has been a leader in supporting such vital efforts as the Family Crisis Center and the Emergency Fund Center, which help persons needing food, shelter, and other critical assistance.

In addition, the Church has worked actively with the Tri-Valley Haven for Women, which ministers to women and children suffering from abusive situations. First Presbyterian has also played a lead role in the Interfaith Backpack project, through which the greater religious community works together at the beginning of each school year to provide backpacks for young people whose families can't afford them.

First Presbyterian celebrates its 125th anniversary with the grateful knowledge that it has improved the lives of countless men, women, and children in central California. In coming years, this legacy will serve to inspire new acts of charity and generosity that, in themselves, will encourage others to serve as they have been served. It is an honor for me to recognize First Presbyterian Church of Livermore in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to express my personal thanks to Pastor William E. Nebo and all the members of the Church for what they are doing to build the Livermore community. My best to each of them on this unique and special occasion.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, January 3, 1996, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

COMMON-SENSE CAMPAIGN REFORMS

The past year was productive for congressional reform. Congress acted to apply private sector laws to Congress, ban gifts, and restrict lobbying. These common-sense reforms are important, and Congress should build on this momentum and pass sweeping campaign finance reform this year.

In the past few decades, Congress has made substantial progress in opening up the political process and making Members more accountable. Members of Congress are now required to make comprehensive financial disclosure, and public and private transactions are subject to careful scrutiny. This exposure is directly responsible for the numerous successful ethics investigations in recent years. Prior to these changes—thirty, fifty, or a hundred years ago—such ethics violations were rarely prosecuted because the public knew nothing about them. We need to build continually on this progress, including the important steps taken last year.

CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Last January Congress passed a law to apply private sector laws to Congress. This legislation was based on a recommendation of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which I co-chaired, and is an expansion of a measure passed by the House in 1994. This new law establishes an Office of Compliance to apply these laws to Congress, including labor regulations of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA).

LOBBYING REFORM

With my strong support, Congress passed a lobbying reform law that requires paid lobbyists to disclose who pays them, whom they lobby, what issues they lobby for, and how much they are paid to influence the government. A similar bill was filibustered by the Senate in 1994. I am pleased that leaders of both parties removed their opposition to these reforms.

GIFT BAN

The House passed a bill to ban all gifts to Members, with limited exceptions for close family or friends. There is simply no reason to take valuable gifts, meals, or vacations from lobbyists.

THE 1996 REFORM AGENDA

We must push hard for additional reforms in 1996. The forces against reform are strong—last year lobbying reform and the gift ban were blocked five times before public pressure forced the House leadership to have a vote. Congress must build on these successes to complete additional reforms.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The overriding reform issue for 1996 is campaign finance reform. Some observers liken congressional reform to a three-legged stool. Banning gifts and restricting lobbying are the first two legs, but without the third leg—campaign finance reform—the stool will fall over. Hoosiers are fed up with the flood of campaign money and favors from lobbyists.

I have expressed the concern for many years that money plays a disproportionate role in American politics. The system forces candidates to spend too much time raising

money instead of meeting with the public and focusing on issues of national importance. My sense is that the public will demand major change in the present system. Reforming campaign finance is critical if Congress is to be a truly representative body.

There are a number of key issues in campaign finance reform:

Political action committees (PAC's)

The importance of PACs should be reduced. We should cap total PAC contributions to a candidate and reduce the limit on contributions from a single PAC. Members of Congress should also be prohibited from running "leadership PACs", which a few Members use to gain power and influence over other Members for their own personal agenda. We should also block "bundling" of checks by PACs, which evades the \$5,000 limit on PAC contributions.

"Soft money"

We should limit contributions by corporations, wealthy individuals, and other organizations to political parties and PACs affiliated with Members of Congress. These donors now give hundreds of thousands of dollars for "independent" expenditures. While direct expenditures for candidates are prohibited—advertising, campaign salaries, etc.—the indirect efforts, such as organization and issue or party advertising, can be as influential. Because these actions are theoretically not for federal candidates, they skirt federal campaign limits and can avoid public disclosure.

Small contributors

Reforms should emphasize the importance of grassroots political fundraising over big-ticket donors. The number of large contributions should be capped, and candidates should be encouraged to seek a broad base of support from contributions of less than \$200—perhaps with a tax deduction for individuals who make small contributions. A balance should also be struck between small in-state contributions and larger national contributions.

Spending limits

Congress passed some mandatory spending limits in 1974, but the Supreme Court overturned them as an unconstitutional restriction on free speech. We should examine ways to encourage voluntary limits, such as providing reduced-cost television and radio time to candidates who abide by the limits. Presidential campaigns now provide public matching funds for candidates who agree to abide by voluntary spending limits.

Enforcement

Congress must also give more authority to the Federal Election Commission to crack down on election law violations. In one recent case, the FEC needed 12 months to audit a House Member's campaign records that turned out to be fraudulent. Prompt, tough enforcement is the key to cleaning up the system.

CONCLUSION

Congress made significant progress on reforms in 1995, but it must build on that momentum in 1996. Major campaign finance reform will be the overriding reform issue this year in Congress. The purpose of reform is to reduce special interest influence and increase political competition. The campaign finance system may never be perfect, but the influence of money can and should be reduced. Until we begin limiting money's disproportionate influence, public cynicism will continue to grow.

The passage of a complete reform agenda will help demonstrate that members are serious about enhancing the openness, effectiveness, and public credibility of Congress. I

strongly support sweeping campaign finance reform, and will urge my colleagues to act now to make these commonsense changes that reflect on the integrity of Congress.

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1996

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of this bill. While I would have preferred a stronger affirmation of local government's right and responsibility to direct the collection and disposal of its solid waste, this bill makes much needed clarification of the conditions under which flow control authority can be exercised, both now and in the future. Also, this measure is an admirable attempt to strike a balance between promoting competition between solid waste management facilities, and protecting communities, facility owners, and operators who have built facilities on the assumption that they would have a revenue base to finance those facilities.

However, it is not without reservations that I offer my support. Although the bill does grandfather flow control authority for county governments in Washington State that have invested millions of dollars into developing and integrating their disposal systems, the bill does not grandfather flow control authority exercised by the city of Seattle on behalf of my constituents.

It was the city of Seattle's ability to exercise flow control authority over commercial garbage, and its ability to direct contract-collected residential garbage to a designated facility, that made it possible for the city to procure a low-cost long-haul disposal contract in 1989. Simply put, the city's ability to guarantee a large volume of waste to the winning bidder made it possible for the bidders to offer the city the huge financial benefits of economies of scale in providing disposal services.

The ability of the city of Seattle and other jurisdictions who exercise flow control and use competitive contracting to get the best deal for their citizens should be protected under any flow control bill. Unfortunately, this bill does not.

While I am supporting this bill at this time, I am reserving judgment on the final bill that emerges from House and Senate negotiations. I hope to work with the committee to craft a final bill that better protects the citizens of Seattle and the nationally recognized solid waste management system the city has created.

OIL SPILL PROTECTION

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague, Representative PATRICK KENNEDY, in an effort to protect Rhode Island's precious coastline from the environmental devastation of oil spills.

Tragically, on January 19, the tug boat *Scandia* caught fire in severe weather off the coast of my congressional district.

The tug's crew could not control the fire and abandoned both the tug and the barge's cargo of 4 million gallons of oil to the high winds and seas.

While the tug crew was swiftly pulled from the sea by brave members of the Coast Guard, the same cannot be said for the unmanned barge which spilled 1 million gallons of oil off the Rhode Island coast.

The environmental and economic destruction of the spill is, at the present time, incalculable. Indeed, no one can estimate the damage to the fishery's long-term health, the wildlife, or my State's tourism industry.

But what has become clear in articles from the Providence Journal and my own experience as a member of the now defunct Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, is that Congress must address the growing reliance of this Nation on towing vessels to transport hazardous materials like oil.

It may surprise some of my colleagues that a tug boat which pulls 4 million gallons of oil and has a crew of 6 is not required to be inspected by the Coast Guard.

That's correct, the tug boat that pulled thousands of barrels of oil off the coast of my district and the estimated 2 to 4 barges that ply the waters of Narragansett Bay each day do not even get inspected once a year like an automobile.

Moreover, even though the *Scandia's* pilot had a master's license, no license is actually required to pilot these vessels.

And, perhaps even more disturbing is the fact that tug boats are not required to have some of the most basic navigational and safety equipment on board.

This body has tried to address this situation in previous years, only to have efforts to improve tug safety sink in the other body.

However, I would urge my colleagues, especially those from our Nation's coastal States, to consider joining me and Congressman KENNEDY in supporting legislation that tries to prevent avoidable accidents in the future.

The Towing Vessel Safety Act of 1996 takes a better safe than sorry approach to protecting our Nation's environment and the hard-working families who make their living on the water.

This legislation will require tugs that pull hazardous materials to be inspected once a year, just like the cars of my constituents.

It will also establish licensing standards for the pilot and crew of tug boats towing hazardous materials, just like truckers who have a license to carry these items.

The bill would also ask the Coast Guard and Secretary of Transportation to ensure that tug boats carry basic navigational items like a radar system, a compass, and up-to-date charts as well as adequate fire fighting equipment, just as oil tankers must do.

The legislation protects crew members who report safety violations from wrongful discharge, like other employees who handle volatile cargo.

These common sense, preventative measures are a responsible first-step in addressing the increase in oil barge traffic off our Nation's pristine beaches. Indeed, the National Transportation Safety Board has made similar recommendations in the past.

At the same time, we need to take other steps to ensure that the barges pulled by

these tugs are safe, and in the weeks to come we will be examining legislation to accomplish this aim.

The Coast Guard recognizes that there is a need to improve tug and barge safety, and it has proposed some new safety measures. And, the towing industry plans to have a self-inspection regime ready in 2 years.

However, I believe we need to take direct, reasonable steps to prevent environmental and economic catastrophes like the spill off Rhode Island.

Prevention is not without cost, but as the saying goes, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

At the present time, questions remain as to the cause of the accident and whether the accident could have been prevented, but concerns remain that this disaster was preventable. It is in this spirit that we are introducing the Towing Vessel Safety Act.

Mr. Speaker, my State has seen the results of an oil spill once, and I hope this legislation can reduce the chances of it happening again.

NORMA MATHES KNIGHT, KINGS PARK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 1995 WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my sincere congratulations to Norma Mathes Knight on being named the Kings Park, NY, Chamber of Commerce 1995 Woman of the Year.

In 1963, Norma Mathes Knight, her husband Harold (Harry) Mathes and their daughters Patricia, Marilyn, and son Bill moved to Fort Salonga in Suffolk County, NY.

Patricia was then a freshman at Immaculate College in Pennsylvania, Marilyn a freshman at Kings Park High School, and Bill a student at Ralph J. Osgood Elementary School.

In 1970, Norma and Harry opened Mathes & Son, Inc. at 95 Pulaski Road in Kings Park. In 1980, they bought the building at 101 Pulaski Road where their business Mathes & Son Auto Parts Supply became a familiar sight and an integral part of the hamlet of Kings Park. This year will mark the 25th anniversary in business of Mathes & Son.

Norma was one of the founding members of the Kings Park Chamber of Commerce. In 1971, she became one of its original directors. She is presently the vice president of the chamber. Her participation in all aspects of the functioning of the chamber has not only been an integral part of Norma's life, but has served as an outstanding contribution and benefit to the entire community.

Norma has dedicated herself to improving the quality of life for others. She has demonstrated this over and over through her involvement and deep commitment to community service. She is also a member of the Fort Salonga Civic Association, St. Charles Hospital Auxiliary, and the Smithtown Professional Women's Network.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Norma Mathes Knight for her outstanding commitment and selfless dedication to her community, and to extend our best wishes and congratulations on her being named 1995 Woman of the Year.

INDIA'S NUCLEAR PROGRAM

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Government of India appears to be playing a game of nuclear chicken with the United States. In the past 3 months India has: Prepared for nuclear testing, tested for eventual deployment of the medium-range Prithvi missile, capable of carrying nuclear warheads, and repudiated the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

While India—under great pressure from the United States and the lender nations—reluctantly decided to refrain from nuclear testing for the time being, it is planning to go ahead with testing and deployment of its medium-range Prithvi missile, possibly even as we meet here today. The United States has urged India not to proceed with the deployment of the Prithvi missiles because deployment could increase tensions between India and Pakistan, the only nation within logistical range of this new Indian offensive weapons system. The United States has urged restraint in missile development and deployment on the subcontinent as we continue our efforts to reduce tensions and slow the arms buildup.

One hears all kinds of rather lame excuses for India's potential Prithvi deployment. The Indian Government would lead us to believe that deployment is being done in response to internal domestic political pressure. Issues that affect the security and safety of an entire subcontinent, such as nuclear and missile proliferation, cannot and should not be equated with political expediency. The internal political pressures cannot be carelessly applied when the result of those pressures is a direct threat to Pakistan's security. And surely if this rationale for nuclear provocation is good for the goose, will it not soon become equally good for the gander?

Mr. Speaker, since 1974 India has freely pursued its nuclear program. Pakistan, on the other hand has been severely penalized: for 10 years Pakistan has endured the Pressler sanctions that have adversely affected Pakistan's conventional defense. Yet Pakistan has consistently supported the elimination of nuclear weapons in the region. Since 1974 Pakistan has proposed to India the establishment of a nuclear weapons free zone in south Asia (1974); a joint Indo-Pakistan declaration renouncing the acquisition and manufacture of nuclear weapons (1978); mutual inspections by India and Pakistan of nuclear facilities (1979); simultaneous adherence to the NPT by India and Pakistan (1979); simultaneous acceptance of full-scope IAEA safeguards (1979); agreement on a bilateral or regional nuclear test ban treaty (1987); commencement of a multilateral conference on the nuclear proliferation in south Asia (1991); and creation of a missile-free zone in south Asia (1993).

All of these proposals have been rejected by India.

Mr. Speaker, if Pakistan and India are ever to resolve the differences between them it must be done through confidence-building measures, not through an arms race or nuclear contest. Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto of Pakistan and her predecessors have made a series of good faith gestures, and have put significant non-proliferation proposals on the

table. Pakistan has demonstrated significant restraint in its own sophisticated technological program. It is long time that such restraint be matched by India, and that India respond substantively to the arms reduction proposals that have been promulgated by Islamabad. And above all, Mr. Speaker, this is hardly the right time or the right circumstances for a major provocation such as the deployment of the Indian Prithvi program.

I urge the President and the Secretary of State to use their good offices to have New Delhi take positive steps forward, not dangerous steps backward.

HONORING DR. DUANE R. BROWN

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise before my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to recognize Duane Brown, Ph.D. Dr. Brown is retiring today after almost 29 years in the field of education.

Dr. Brown began his career in 1957 in the Flint community schools. Starting out as a community school director he quickly showed he understood the importance of the community's role in the education of the students. He worked tirelessly with the parents and other community members to insure that each and every child had the best education possible. He worked with numerous organizations throughout the community to provide whatever services the residents of the community needed, whether that person was a student, parent or member of the community. At various stages in Dr. Brown's career he served as a principal and a director of elementary education. While serving as principal at Williams Community Education Center; he was responsible for the coordination of a comprehensive elementary school, recreational center, and facility offering health and other needed community services to the students and residents of the area; a true full service school.

In 1978, Dr. Brown began serving as executive director of the National Center for Community Education. It was through this center that Dr. Brown continued his mission by traveling to nearly every State in our great Nation and several foreign countries to conduct workshops for educators and parents on the benefits of community education. Additionally, many thousands of people have traveled from all over the world to the National Center and the Flint School District to learn more about community education. It was through these opportunities that many participants came to realize the dream that Charles Stewart Mott and Frank Manley had many years ago, when they looked around the Flint community at the many empty school buildings commenting and dreaming about all of the wonderful clubs for the young people.

Mr. Speaker, Duane R. Brown is one of those educators that each of us as parents hope our children have the opportunity to become acquainted with because he cares. It is with great pleasure that I stand before you today to ask you and my fellow members of the 104th Congress to join me in paying tribute to a individual who certainly made his community a better place for all because he was there.

IN COMMEMORATION OF KINDNESS WEEK

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the Kindness Foundation of Dallas, TX, and to praise their efforts to establish the week of February 11–18, 1996, as Kindness Week in Texas.

The Kindness Foundation's mission is to improve the quality of life throughout Dallas, and challenge every city in the United States to encourage intentional acts of kindness among all of its citizens.

The Foundation was founded by Dee Silverstein and Jackie Waldman of Dallas after they were inspired by the movie, *Schindler's List*. Silverstein and Waldman were struck by the impact that one committed individual could make in the world. They realized that they too could make a difference and sought the counsel of the late James C. McCormick, a best-selling author and prominent Dallas area businessman and city leader; together the three enlisted the help of other committed Texans to form Dallas Acts Kind, the grassroots group that organized Kindness Week '95.

The Dallas mayor endorsed the idea and declared February 12–18 1995, Dallas Acts Kind Week. The first week of its kind, the event was a huge success. Activities included a Kindness Youth Rally for 16,000 area seventh and eighth graders with a message to make kindness a way of life, an All-City Rally promoting racial harmony and religious tolerance, and a gathering in Thanks-Giving Square to celebrate unity.

As a result of Dallas Acts Kind Week '95, a Universal Prayer was written by leaders of the three monotheistic religions—Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.

In addition, the success of last year's event prompted Dr. Don Benton, a pastor in the United Methodist Church, to accept a calling to serve as the first president of The Kindness Foundation.

For 1996, a special task force has been coordinating the efforts of more than 100 volunteers in planning for Kindness Week '96. Thus far, events will include a youth rally designed to promote kindness as a strength, the planting of the first "Kindness Tree," an interfaith service, a free showing of *Schindler's List*, an evening of multicultural family entertainment, and a city-wide rally organized to foster oneness.

The Kindness Foundation was created by three caring individuals who were committed to make their community a better place in which to live. Since then, many more have joined them in this worthy cause. It is now up to all of us to participate in the effort to spread kindness in the course of our daily lives. After all, we all share the responsibility in building nurturing and supportive communities.

THE 104TH CONGRESS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday,

January 10, 1996, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 104TH CONGRESS

It is hard to remember a busier session of Congress than the first year of the 104th Congress in 1995. The House was in session through Christmas, and cast over 880 votes. But is also true that the achievements of the first session are meager. Even the strongest champions of the first session admit the sparse results and say the session made history but not laws.

CONGRESSIONAL AGENDA

The new congressional leadership certainly defined the debate during 1995 and they deserve credit for making a start on the central question of balancing the federal budget by the year 2002. Major progress was made in reducing the deficit and trimming the size of government in the first two years of the Clinton Administration, and the new congressional leadership is building on those achievements. The issue now is not whether the budget should be balanced, but how; and not whether federal responsibilities should be devolved to the states, but which ones. I voted for a seven-year balanced budget, a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and a line-item veto.

Some of the major achievements of the session came on issues that transcended partisan politics. Congress, with my support, passed long delayed legislation to tighten registration and disclosure rules for lobbyists; banned virtually all gifts to lawmakers, including expensive paid trips to resorts; required Congress to abide by federal workplace laws; and limited the imposition of unfunded mandates on states and localities.

The congressional leadership has brought about major changes in the manner Congress operates. Speaker Gingrich has centralized power in his office, at the expense of the committee system. For the most part, he has simply bypassed the slow process of congressional hearings and committee work, and attempted to use spending bills to make changes in policy. He has succeeded in keeping a remarkable level of discipline in his caucus.

FAILURES

Even so, the ambitions of the new House leadership have outstripped its achievements

and left one of the least productive sessions in modern history in terms of the number of laws enacted. The most important piece of legislation—a huge omnibus bill calling for reform of hundreds of programs and a seven year plan to balance the budget—remains stalled in negotiations with the White House. In all, 67 bills were enacted into law in 1995, by far the lowest number for a first session of Congress since the end of World War II. Among them are six of the 13 annual appropriations bills funding the operations of the government that should have been passed by October 1, 1995.

The list of items under the Contract with America not passed is extensive. It includes a balanced budget amendment, a line item veto, crime bill, welfare reform, tax cuts, national security measures, deregulation, litigation restraints, and term limits. Speaker Gingrich was able to get most of his Contract through the House with ease, but came up hard against the unique role that the Constitution gives to the Senate. The Senate traditionally serves as a break on the excesses of the House. The revolutionary zeal that has often marked the Republicans in the House still courses through the House, but the Senate has proved to be far more cautious and skeptical, slowing some measures and blocking others.

This has been a special-interest driven Congress. I suppose that's always true to some extent, but the new Republican leadership, while vowing to end it, just came up with a new list of political winners and losers. The working poor have certainly been on the wrong side of their list; the wealthy on the right side. It is one thing to run on a promise of curbing all government entitlements to everyone but quite another to target lower income working Americans for a disproportionate share of the cuts. Many members came to Congress this year to shake up Washington, but they have become among the leaders in campaign contributions from special interests. As a remedy, I support sweeping campaign finance reform, and will urge its consideration this year.

LACK OF CIVILITY

The congressional session was as contentious as I can remember, epitomized by the bitter fight over the budget that closed the

government for 21 days—a record—and kept Congress in session over Christmas for the first time in 15 years, and reached new heights for vituperative debate.

I have seen more flat-out partisanship in the House this year than ever before. It spreads from the floor to the committees, which were once largely free of it, and certainly to the television cameras. There have been shouting and shoving matches on and off the House floor and harsh partisan and personal attacks.

RETIREMENTS

There's not much doubt that Congress is going through a real shakeout. So far, 24 members of the House and 12 members of the Senate have announced their retirements, with another 10 House members running for higher office. Many have talked about the very long hours and demanding schedule. Others have cited the extreme partisanship. Still others have said they simply want to pursue other career opportunities, and spend more time with their families.

Change and turnover can be beneficial as new members bring fresh energy and new ideas to the institution. Congress, however, also benefits from the leadership and experience of veteran legislators, who know how to build consensus and make the legislative process work. My concern is that so many retirements come from the political center of both parties. Moderates are where most of the American people are on issues. What we need in Congress and government today is a dynamic center that represents and responds to the needs and concerns of the average American, not special interests on the right and left.

CONCLUSION

My own guess is that, under the present balance of forces in the White House and Congress, all of the questions on the budget and the role of government will not be resolved completely. We can reasonably expect incremental changes, rather than revolution. Nobody knows, of course, what happens to the Republican proposals in the days ahead. Many of the questions, unsettled in 1995, may be resolved in 1996.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, February 1, 1996, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 2

9:30 a.m.

Joint Economic

To hold hearings to examine the employment-unemployment situation for January.

SD-562

FEBRUARY 5

1:00 p.m.

Joint Economic

To hold hearings to examine Federal barriers to State and local privatization efforts.

SD-106

FEBRUARY 6

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

Immigration Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the use of the Supplemental Security Income program and other welfare programs by immigrants.

SD-226

2:00 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review trends in Federal land ownership.

SD-366

FEBRUARY 28

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the Disabled American Veterans.

345 Cannon Building

MARCH 5

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to re-

view the legislative recommendations of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

345 Cannon Building

MARCH 14

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Jewish War Veterans, the Retired Officers Association, the Association of the U.S. Army, the Non-Commissioned Officers Association, and the Blinded Veterans Association.

345 Cannon Building

MARCH 27

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the Veterans of World War I, AMVETS, the American Ex-Prisoners of War, the Vietnam Veterans of America, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart.

345 Cannon Building

SEPTEMBER 17

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the American Legion.

335 Cannon Building